

Appl. No. : 09/938,804
Filed : August 24, 2001

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed November 17, 2005 and the Advisory Action mailed February 7, 2006, Applicant has amended the application as above. Claims 1, 15, 19, 25-27, and 35 have been amended. Claims 1-36 are now pending in this application. No new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the remarks set forth below.

Discussion of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Claims 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the description requirement in the Final Office action. In the Reply to Final Office Action mailed January 16, 2006, Applicant cited support for the features rejected as follows:

Regarding Claim 29, the limitation “each byte comprises eight bits and wherein each bit is displayed as a unique pixel” is at least supported by page 9, lines 17-19 and page 12, line 31 to page 13, line 1. Regarding Claim 30, the limitation “inserting bytes having non-white pixels into a series of bytes having non non-white pixels comprises eliminating at least a portion of the identified gaps in character strokes” is at least supported by page 2, lines 21-31 and Figure 7. Regarding Claim 31, the limitation “wherein the received bitmap comprises a plurality of bytes and wherein the locating of bytes having no non-white pixels comprises comparing vertically adjacent ones of the bytes of the bitmap” is at least supported by page 13, line 26 to page 14, line 7.

In the advisory action mailed February 7, 2006, the Examiner concluded that he cannot find the cited locations above support the limitation as follows:

Regarding the Applicant’s discussion of the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections, the Applicant cited the supports for the rejected limitations. However after consideration, the Examiner still does not find the cited locations support the limitation. For example, page 9, lines 17-19 merely teaches the recognition enhancement by selectively insert bit elements into the calculation regions. Also, page 12, line 31 to page 13, line 1 only discloses concept of black and white pixel. Thus, nowhere in these locations support the aforementioned limitation above. Similarly, other cited locations do not supported the rejected limitations under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s conclusions for the reasons stated below.

With regard to Claim 29, the Examiner states that “[p]age 9, lines 17-19 merely teaches the recognition enhancement by selectively insert bit elements into the calculation regions.” The language on Page 9, lines 17-19 reads as “[t]he system and method includes ways to enhance optical recognition of digitized images through selective insertion of bit elements (pixels) at

Appl. No. : **09/938,804**
Filed : **August 24, 2001**

calculated locations within a bitmap.” This language teaches that each bit is a pixel, thus providing support for limitation “each byte comprises eight bits and wherein each bit is displayed as a unique pixel”.

The Examiner further states that “[p]age 12, line 31 to page 13, line 1 only discloses concept of black and white pixel.” The language on Page 12, line 31 to page 13, line 1 reads as “[t]he bitmap is patterned into singularly discrete areas represented as bits and displayed as pixels.” This language teaches that each bit is displayed as a pixel and also provide clear support for the rejected limitation of Claim 29.

The Examiner then concludes that “nowhere in these locations support the aforementioned limitation above [of Claim 29]”. But the above discussion makes it clear that the cited language provides adequate support for the rejected limitation of Claim 29. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 29 has been overcome.

With regard to Claims 30 and 31, the Examiner merely made a conclusory finding, stating that “[s]imilarly, other cited locations do not support the rejected limitations....” However, because each Claim has different limitations for which different supporting text is cited, they cannot be similar. The Examiner’s failure to give specific reasons for rejecting supports cited for Claims 30 and 31 deprives Applicant of an opportunity to respond in a meaningful way. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to provide a *prima facie* rejection of Claims 30 and 31 and that Claims 30 and 31 are in condition for allowance.

Discussion of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 15, 19, 24-27, and 30-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huttenlocher (US 6,249,604).

Each of the independent Claims 1, 15, 19, 25-27, and 35 as amended refers to identification of gaps within the pattern of character strokes. Huttenlocher neither teaches nor suggests this feature. Moreover, on the page 2 of the Advisory Action, it is indicated that this feature would be able to overcome the Huttenlocher reference. Therefore, Claims 1, 15, 19, 24-27, and 30-35 are not anticipated by Huttenlocher. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Appl. No. : 09/938,804
Filed : August 24, 2001

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-4, 16-18, 20-24, and 28-35 are dependent either directly or indirectly on the above-discussed independent Claims 1, 15, 19, 25-27, and 35. Applicant respectfully submits that pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶4, the dependent claims incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer and include their own patentable features, and are therefore in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of all claim rejections and prompt allowance of the claims.

Conclusion

In light of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are specifically requested. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the above-identified application are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner finds any impediment to allowing all claims that can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 4/17/06

By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

2522153
041306